DOCUMENT RESUME

HE 000 499

ED 027 828

By-Henderson, Algo D.

The Administrator/Student Conflict.

Pub Date Nov 68

Note-13p.

Journal Cit-Administrative Law Review; v21 n1 p65-77 Nov 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75

Descriptors-*Administrator Qualifications, Administrator Responsibility, *Higher Education, *Student Alienation, *Student Attitudes, Student School Relationship, *University Administration

Colleges are undergoing a transition from having responsibility for the protective care of students in loco parentis to the position of treating and counseling students as young adults. Many administrators are academic specialists, but are not prepared to respond to the basic questions raised by students about the university's role as an educational institution and its role in society. The growing permissiveness of parents and exposure to today's communications media have produced more sophisticated college-age children over whom administrators can no longer assume an arbitrary authority. Administrators are usually confronted with problems arising from 1 of 2 sources: (1) militant student and faculty insistence that the institution should take leadership in social action, and (2) student pressures for change in the institution itself. The numerous criticisms that evolve from these sources seem to be justified. Unfortunately, many administrators have resisted new ideas and maintained bureaucratic modes of administration, actions that have turned student agressions from the solution of educational problems to the achievement of student power. It is suggested that administrators be more qualified for their responsibilities. It is felt that they should have qualifications in addition to a reputation as a scholar or a scientist, in order to communicate effectively with modern students. (WM)

ED027829

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE ADMINISTRATOR/STUDENT CONFLICT

ALGO D. HENDERSON*

Universities foster change, and they react to impacts from change. The president and other administrative leaders are caught in the middle. As the liaison between the folk culture and the super culture, they become squeezed by the pressures toward conformity, on the one hand, and toward social evolution, on the other.

The egalitarian movement in higher education is another factor. The institutions are being pressured to respond to the needs of students of varying ages, abilities, and interests, and for services to the disadvantaged segments of the population. This introduces problems relating to the civil liberties of the students and to the design of the educational program. On these, there are profound differences of opinion.

Too many of the administrators are not prepared for what is happening. They are academic specialists, whereas the problems with which they have to deal are general and pervasive in our society. The administrators lose sight of the university as a collegium. They use authoritarian methods; they become captives of the physical and financial aspects; they fail in intellectual leadership and become timid in asserting the functional role of the university in society. They have had no training for administrative responsibility or for educational leadership.

Students, in spite of instances of irritating and disturbing actions, are raising basic questions about the university as an educational institution and about its role in society.

The Transition from "In Loco Parentis"

Colleges are undergoing a transition from having responsibility for the protective care of the students "in loco parentis" to the position of treating and counseling students as young adults. Presidents and deans are

---

*Dr. Algo Donmeyer Henderson is a research educator and professor at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Henderson graduated from Georgetown University in 1918, received his L.L.B. from the University of Kansas in 1921, his M.B.A. at Harvard in 1928, and L.L.D. from Antioch College. He is the author of a book titled *Policies and Practices of Higher Education* published in 1960 and a frequent contributor to educational journals.

HE000 499

caught between opposing forces that represent strong views on the respective sides of the subject.

To appreciate the change that is taking place, it is necessary to consider a bit of history about colleges and universities. In the earlier periods of our history before the public secondary school became universal, the ages of the students were much younger—commonly fifteen to eighteen. Also, most colleges had preparatory departments and thus large numbers of students who were adolescents. Until comparatively recently, colleges were predominantly private and often church-related. The idea of having a lay person rather than a cleric as president is recent. In the past, therefore, colleges had been strongly oriented toward the inclusion of religious and moral teaching as a part of the curriculum and as influencing the moral behavior of the students. Students were disciplined, fined, or expelled for violations of rules and regulations. On the ground that they should not learn to be playful, Cokesbury College fined students who remained in their bath for more than one minute!

Today the typical entrance age of college students is eighteen and the average age much older. Indeed, among urban universities the mode is well above twenty-one. Prep schools have been eliminated from the college campuses, but at the other end of the age continuum there have been large additions of students in the professional schools and in graduate education. Programs in adult education have grown by leaps and bounds and especially in urban situations where the commuting is easy. This means an infusion of part-time students of older age, most of whom are married, have families, and live at home. Since World War II, the percentage of students attending public institutions of higher education has been rapidly enlarging and they now considerably exceed those going to private colleges. The public universities do not view the teaching of religion and morals in the same light as do the church-related institutions and indeed are prohibited from indoctrinating in particular religions. With automobiles—and parents provide them—it is impossible to "keep diligent watch" over the co-eds, as Horace Mann once advised The University of Michigan to do.

Two other trends have been affecting the college situation. One has been the growing permissiveness of parents and the parental discarding of older disciplinary forms. The other is that the children have become more sophisticated. This is in part the result of today's methods of communication and transportation, plus such exposures to knowledge and ideas as come through the radio and television. But parents typically treat their own children of college age as adults in that they serve them with

intoxicating liquor, discuss sex somewhat freely, and admit children to the discussion circle when ideas are being weighed. When fathers attend fraternity parties, they become just as drunk as do their sons, sometimes more so. Some mothers are now giving to their daughters in college the "pill." It should be remembered, too, that young men and women are eligible for, or, indeed, being drafted into the armed services at age eighteen. Currently there is a growing belief that the voting age should be lowered to eighteen.

It seems clear from this brief recital that the practice *in loco parentis* is no longer tenable. On the other hand, parents continue to expect the college to maintain this relationship. As one parent said: "If my son dates a Negro girl, I want the university to tell me." They permit their eighteen-year-olds to accept a job in a distant city without fatherly supervision; but when the youth goes to college, the older image of the institution prevails. The general public, at least those who become agitated about student behavior, also think that the college should "crack down" on the students.

Unfortunately for them, it is the role of the president and his administrative associates to protect and extend the image of the university. The image needs to be good, not necessarily in the academic sense, but good in whatever sense the public expects of it. This is necessary because of the dependence of the institution upon the public or public bodies for funds and the need to have environmental conditions that attract students and permit good operation.

The president and deans find themselves confused because they have not sufficiently analyzed the changes that have been taking place. In their zeal to defend the institution against hostile attacks from the parents and the public, they paint an image of the campus and hence arouse an expectation that is inaccurate and misrepresentative. In the days when smoking by women was highly controversial, I recall one president who told me that his university had strong rules against smoking by women; then with a wink, he said: "But we know that they do." The administrators do not work sufficiently with faculty and students to develop a positive policy and a rationale for it. The concept of *in loco parentis* must be laid to rest, because it is dead. The substitute should be a program of counseling, staffed by professionally trained personnel. The effort should be directed to educating the student and also developing *group* concern for an environment conducive to good education. Tensions in the area of student behavior are inevitable but do not need to assume a large order of magnitude.

Civil Liberties for Students

College administrators assume an arbitrary authority over students that they no longer possess. This is because there is a trend in court decisions to identify students' rights with civil liberties and hence to require that the colleges use procedures that protect these rights. The colleges have not had such procedures for students.

Heretofore presidents and deans have assumed that the college had the right to determine who might enter as a student and who might remain in instances where the rules and regulations were not fully obeyed. Many administrators continue to act upon these assumptions, but the assumptions are no longer valid. Some states have enacted fair education practice laws which require equality of opportunity in admissions on grounds of race, color, and national origin and also in the cases of creed, excepting where the institution is clearly under the control of a religious body. But of greater significance, the courts have become increasingly willing to hear the complaints of students who accuse the institution of arbitrary actions.

The colleges and universities have generally accepted the principle that faculty members are entitled to hearings when their tenure of office is questioned. Most of the national organizations of colleges and universities have adopted uniform policies concerning academic freedom and tenure. Consistent with this, the individual institutions have codified the procedures, sometimes with minor variations.

An effort is now being made to define similar agreement on the rights and freedoms of students. Leaders in the movement have been the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the U.S. National Student Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Speaking of the procedural standards in disciplinary proceedings, the Preliminary Statement says:

> In all situations procedural fair play requires that the student be informed of the nature of the charges against him, that he be given a fair opportunity to refute them, that the institution not be arbitrary in its actions and that there be provision for appeal of a decision.

These requirements are essentially the same as those laid down by the courts in recent years when applying the principle of due process of law to student cases.

It may be said, therefore, that the college administrator may no longer act in a disciplinary case as he formerly might have done. In particular, he

may not make arbitrary decisions. Instead, the institution must provide due process.

Administrators tend to be impatient with this new development, partly because it is time-consuming and partly because it prevents the president from showing the public that "proper"discipline has been administered. Thus the institution supports arbitrary action instead of fair play and due process. Although administrators give lip service to concepts of civil liberties, they have not applied them when dealing with students. In both the admission and the retention of students, many administrators do not accept the implications of the egalitarian movement in higher education that has taken place since World War II.

The Impacts of Students' Ideas for Change in the University

In social thought and action, the university has been displacing the church as the best source of insights and wisdom. This is because the university ideally is dedicated to the search for truth about man, society, and the universe. Society thus increasingly leans upon the university for ethical and ideological guidance. The university influences social change and in instances initiates change.

The students are right in some of their criticisms of the university. It is overspecialized and fragmented; it is becoming enslaved to the research and service demands of government and industry; its indoctrination with Western values rather than world-oriented values leads to some unfortunate consequences; it has been losing sight of its larger role in society.

Students of today are deeply concerned about the great issues of our time—the morality of war, the disparities between affluence and poverty, racism, materialism as incentive, and the neglected social ills. They are interested in the college and university, its purposes, programs, and achievements. The students feel that they have something important to say to the administrators and the faculty and, indeed, to the governing board on all of these matters.

The problems that confront the administrator usually arise from one of two sources. The first of these is the insistence of the more militant student and faculty groups that the college should take leadership in social action. This view is strongly opposed by faculty who are research rather than action oriented and who believe that the main purpose of the university would be adulterated if the energies were not given fully to the exploration of knowledge. The view is also opposed by most trustees and administrators on the ground that off-campus action involves

unwarranted interference in the affairs of others. Thus an issue is joined between two factions, each of which feels deeply.

In these circumstances it is important that the president or dean shall have enough historical perspective concerning the role of colleges and universities to enable him to pursue a wise course of action. By its nature a college or university is an agent of social change. This can clearly be seen in non-controversial areas. The land-grant university program was launched for the very purpose of reforming the practices in agriculture and of giving further impetus to the industrial revolution. Medical schools have become the fountainhead of knowledge relating to illnesses and public health. It was professors of Harvard joining with research staff from IBM that produced the first computer, which has been having a revolutionary effect in business, engineering, education, and research.

Universities have also been responsibile for profound changes in controversial areas. Advocating the theory of evolution is an example. Persuading the government to use macroeconomic theory in its financial and budgetary policies, displacing the Adam Smith doctrine, is a more recent example. The value of these influences can now be appreciated because of the perspective of time. What is intensely controversial at one moment of history, as was the theory of evolution, becomes widely accepted in another decade. It may be argued that these theories are the fruits of individual scholars; but it is also true that the institution as a whole has swung its support behind the ideas.

The immediate problem stems from the fact that although the university arises from the folk culture, it become a super culture. The folk culture is stable and the tendency is to preserve the status quo. On the other hand, it is the business of the university to examine hypotheses and data with the view of discovering more accurately what truth is. Suppose, for example, that scientists had accepted the prevailing notion just a few years ago that the atom was the smallest element in nature. We would not have discovered atomic power. Since people of conservative tendencies do not like to be disturbed in their thinking, they resent the college or university if it questions their beliefs and modes of behavior. Social action in controversial areas has this result.

The advocacy of social change based upon the findings of research, however, is a different matter from committing the institution to a particular ideology. An ideology can prove to be limiting intellectually. For example, the Russians discovered that their indoctrination in one theory of genetics had been leading them up a blind alley. The too close conformity to the prevailing political and social institutions is a form of indoctrination. So also is Mao's little red book. An educational

institution has as its central mission free inquiry. It should not put blinders on its eyes.

Another borderline of action is encountered through the process of arriving at concerted action. The objectives of a university require free action. Hence it is not tenable for a minority to impose its views and values upon the majority as militant groups sometimes want to do. The group participative plan of organization described below provides a means through which to arrive at sufficient consensus for instutitonal action.

As a corollary, however, it is most important in a college or university to maintain freedom of action for individuals and for groups who, acting for themselves, make it clear that they are not speaking for the institution. To avoid frustrations, which encourage confrontations within the university, it is essential to avoid restraints on off-campus political and social activities. Governing boards and autocratically-minded presidents are seriously in error when they endeavor to limit these freedoms. Furthermore, from the civil liberties' viewpoint, they have no right to do so. Faculty and students are also citizens.

In the area of social action, presidents typically are much too timid. They are so afraid of injuring the image of the institution by siding with faculty and students in unpopular causes that they have an opposite influence. The long-run effect is mediocrity. A president of a university is not merely a manager of budgets, plant, and people; he is, or should be, an educational leader. This leadership should not be limited to the confines of the campus. Indeed, the president is inevitably also a civic leader. Looking backward in time, it can be seen that the really great presidents were men who took vigorous positions on public issues.

Presidents also draw the cloak of academic respectability around the university, emphasizing the research role but denying responsibility for the uses of knowledge. In doing so, they are inconsistent because in non-controversial areas the institution jumps into action. Faculty, working under contracts made by the university, are spending an inordinate amount of time as consultants.

Administrators should not meet all suggestions from students with negative answers or take hostile positions on proposals for social action. Instead, they should provide leadership in distinguishing between theories supported by knowledge and, on the other hand, "isms" and in determining appropriate spheres of action.

The second problem arises because of student pressures for change in the institution itself. It seems apparent from the nationwide ferment among the student bodies that they are greatly dissatisfied and disturbed. They see the multiversity as a huge machine, interested principal-

ly in research rather than teaching and reducing the student to a computer number, and as a factory that processes students for preordained roles in a technological society. They charge that the substantial funds being received from industry and from government for research have distorted the energies of the professors. Not only are the professors neglecting the students, but the ideals of scholarship are being adulterated by materialism. They cause the university to support unhealthy trends in America such as greater influence of militarism over our national government. The university is so much a part of "the establishment" that it has lost its influence as a leavening factor in society. They say that the university faculty have lost their ability to deal intelligently with comprehensive problems because the university has become so fragmented and specialized. One result is that the students no longer get a genuine liberal education. The required courses are merely an assortment of elementary introductions to specializations and the majors are oriented to graduate study. The students feel that they are being victimized by the professional guilds. It is time, they say, to examine all civilizations for their cultural heritage and wisdom, because the too exclusive study of Western culture indoctrinates in such things as white supremacy, the glorification of war, and the infallibility of Judeo-Christian theology. Man, society, and the universe are studied piecemeal without an integration of the pieces. They criticize the quality of the teaching because professors are chosen on the basis of their publications rather than their teaching competence, and the professors give wholly insufficient attention to the design of the courses of instruction. Innovations are virtually impossible.

These and other criticisms of the college and university have validity. Some presidents and deans will agree with them. On the other hand, these officers surrender to the faculty the role of planning and implementing the academic program without providing them with leadership. They feel they have the duty to defend the institution for whatever it is. They point with pride to the renown of the institution in scholarship. They busy themselves with the problems of finance and of plant. So, while the president is collecting funds and erecting monuments, and the departmental faculties are logrolling over specialized curricula and research, the students—supposedly the focus of the university—go unheard.

An overall problem on most campuses about discussing issues, whether social or relating to the university itself, is the lack of good intellectual communication. Administrators talk with adminstrators, lunch together, play golf together. Faculty develop departmental cliques, and these groups lunch together and play bridge together. Faculty meetings are dull and

swamped with minutiae. The intellectual gulf between administrators and faculty is wide. It is even wider between administrators and students. information flows downward and not up. The administrator does not establish avenues through which ideas and complaints can flow to him. The president buries himself in papers that are routine or peripheral to his main role and this, too, constitutes a barrier to students or faculty who want to feed him with ideas. In the large university, the president mixes with faculty only at cocktail parties that resemble madhouses and with students at receptions where the communication is by weary press of the hand.

Interestingly enough, it is the students, and those of the best intellectual quality, who today have the greatest sensitivity to the consequences of the social and educational trends. Sometimes they also have the best ideas for institutional reform. The needling activities of national and local groups, along with the irritations they produce, make constructive contributions. Unfortunately the administrators have resisted ideas to the point where student aggressions turn toward the achievement of student power rather than toward the solution of the educational problems. I am not being naive about the motivations of some of the "new left." The administrative finesse that is needed is to steer the debates over the issues into the rational ground that should be the characteristic of a university. Late as it is in this respect, it is still essential to reorganize the institution to give representation in decision making to the major interest groups, including students, and to set up procedures for an attack on the vital problems.

Should Students Play a Role in College Government?

The authoritarian and bureaucratic modes of administration that prevail among universities are not appropriate for an academic setting. The modern concept of group participation should be adopted. Administrators generally are ignorant of organizational theory and take for granted the existing structures and practices.

College students are engaging in a widespread movement—indeed worldwide—to enlarge the student participation. The agitations on particular campuses are coordinated and to some degree directed by national organizations of students including the U.S. National Student Association whose main objective now is to seek larger student power and the Students for a Democratic Society who advocate a substantial measure of control by students. Administrators are resisting this movement. Faculties generally are opposed to student participation in academic governance. Yet, I insist, students have a significant contribution to make. They intend to be heard and hence, to avoid

recurring crises, orderly involvement in decision making should be provided for.

Student governments exist on nearly every campus, but the students are right in saying that they are Mickey Mouse governments. Their sphere of responsibility is non-academic and largely peripheral to the ongoing work of the campus. Ordinarily the student governments are responsible to a dean of students who exercises the real authority. Student governments are not without some good points including the help that the students can give on matters that are close to them and the advantage to them of gaining experience in organizing and leading activities. But the students are no longer content with the structure. Most of the dynamic action on campus is bypassing the established student government

The students argue that it is they who change and grow in the academic program. They are firsthand observers of the educational process and have judgments about such things as good and bad teaching and whether examinations are consistent with the purposes and content of a course. As the student proceeds beyond his freshman year, he may have a broader view of the curriculum than do many highly specialized instructors. In any event, most students know why they are in college and have ideas to contribute about what the overall character and program of the institution should be. Present-day students are mature and are being challenged by the problems of society. They would like the program of the college to be preparing them for civic, occupational, and cultural activities relevant to these problems. They would like to help determine what the main thrust of the university should be.

The model of organization for a college or university is the bureaucratic one, a concept well described by the German sociologist, Weber. It assumes an administrative structure resembling a vertical pyramid with the decision-making authority at the top and the communication in the form of orders and directives flowing downward. This model is authoritarian. It exists, in part, because the American university is a corporation with a board of governors, the membership of which is largely chosen from industry or professions serving business. Neither the faculty nor students are represented at this high policy-forming level, although in business it would be the businessmen that also form the governing board. Fortunately by tradition the faculty have a large degree of responsibility relating to the academic program. this is right because they are professionally qualified for determining these policies and programs. It is also bad, however, in that the faculty become splintered into departments that build walls around themselves. The student body is the lowest among all of the parties of interest. Furthermore, it is said they are the subjects of

the program and transitory ones at that. It is easy to think of students in the same way that a factory manager thinks of his products. But people do not change and grow unless they are personally involved.

Students are learning that it is possible to exercise a degree of power through staging confrontations or engaging in disruptions. The confrontations usually result in a meeting where communication, though often highly emotional, does take place. Many such confrontations have been successful in securing concessions. It seems probable that in the future this technique of using group pressures will be engaged in more and more both by students and by faculties; hence administrators need to become more skilled in the procedures for negotiation and mediation. In a few states, for example, the faculties are now authorized by law to engage in collective bargaining.

Neither the bureaucratic model nor the chaotic confrontations and disruptions seem appropriate to a collegiate type of institution. The main business of a college takes place between a faculty member and the student or between a faculty member and his colleagues in a research laboratory. The highest degree of intellectual collaboration is essential for the best results. A college should be a community, not a battleground for belligerent forces. The collegial spirit and effort should prevail. Furthermore, modern theory concerning organization conceives of decision making as being a process. It involves the affected people in relation to the degree of their interest; and decisions are best made where the best information lies, subject to whatever scrutiny needs to be made from a higher level of authority.

Modern theory presents an alternative model to the bureaucratic one, namely the group participative model. Policy and program determinations at all levels can be made through the representative participation of all affected groups and this includes student representation. It means that faculty and students, chosen by their respective constituencies, would sit with the president and other academic leaders in determining policies and programs, displacing the oligarchy of administrators. The implementation of the policy and program can then be made through the appropriate administrative officers under the direction of the president.

Both administrators and faculty members need to adjust their thinking about the organization and structure of the university. More than that, the governing boards need to be reorganized so that they will represent in a more balanced way the diverse elements in our society, and including the academic one. An organization of the type I have described will not solve all of the problems, indeed, will not eliminate all confrontations and

violence. If, however, students—and faculty—feel that they have representation in the councils that make decisions about policy and program, it should reduce the impact of the groups that want to resort to violence. Also, if a riot occurs and police or other methods to control it are used after consensus about the actions, the administrator will have substantial support for the decisions. this should make the hot seat less hot. The main point is that the decision making in an education institution should be a shared enterprise.

For the purposes of clarity, I should like to distinguish between the group participative model and that of "participatory democracy." The latter model is being advocated by certain pressure groups. It is essentially an old idea, that of soviets with congenial interests making group decisions for themselves. This sounds attractive, but one trouble with the modern university is that the discrete departmental faculties do precisely this. Furthermore, it is impossible to function if everybody decides everything or if small groups hold a veto power. There needs to be a mechanism for welding the groups into a whole. There needs to be both flexibility and unity. There must be decision making at a level where the institution as a whole can act. The group participative model has these several characteristics. Do students have the right to establish a student government separate from the university? This is a new demand being pressed by militant groups. The legal situation needs to be clarified; but there are some court decisions that suggest that this would not be legal—for example, a New York case that held that a university has the power to regulate national fraternities. Irrespective of the legal aspect, this kind of separation is not good in principle since, if successful, it would lead to the negotiating, mediating type of operation that is antithetical to the nature of the university as an institution.

It should be apparent from this discussion that I believe that college and university administrators should have qualifications for their responsibilities in addition to a reputation as a scholar or a scientist. I do not underestimate the importance of high intellectual achievement. These officers certainly should possess this qualification. The institutions, however, deserve to have at the helm individuals who have attained a matured philosophy of education related to broad intellectual interests, who have historical perspective about higher education, who have an understanding of social dynamics and social change, who have a substantial knowledge of organizational theory and administrative processes, and who know the characteristics of students and can communicate effectively with them. Sensing these kinds of needs, a number of universities have established centers for the study of higher

education which examine the kinds of issues I have raised and involve prospective administrators at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels. The aim is to provide fresh knowledge about higher education and to prepare a new type of educational leader.